UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ᵐⁿ

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,178	02/02/2004	Xiaohong Huang	122.1580	3651

21171   7590   06/11/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/768,178	HUANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James J. Debrow	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 March 2007_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filled 15 Mar. 2007.

2.   Claims 1-14 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

3.   In Applicant's Response dated 15 Mar. 2007, Applicant amended claims 1-12;

added new claims 13 and 14. Applicant argued against all rejections previously set

forth in the Office Action dated 15 Dec. 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   **Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being**

anticipated by Maeda et al. (Pub. No.: US 2006/0004780 A1; effective Filing Date:

Jun. 29, 1999) (hereinafter "Maeda").

        In regards to independent claim 1, Maeda discloses *an apparatus for*

extracting information from a formatted document, comprising:

        an input unit for inputting a formatted document (0037-0039; Maeda discloses a

document obtaining unit for obtaining a structured document.).

a unit for analyzing the input formatted document and saving analysis results

containing particular typographic information (0137-0138; 0344; 0352; 0361; Maeda

discloses the important item extraction unit searches any important item contained in

the received structured document and automatically extracts the important items and

store them in the important item storage unit. The Examiner concludes the "important

items" are the tags, which represent the structure of the document (0039-0040).).

a unit for identifying special character strings on the basis of the analysis results

via preset values of the typographic information (0037-0040; 0214; Maeda discloses an

extracting and storing unit for extracting at least one important portion from the

structured document according to prescribed extraction criteria specified in advance.

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes that "prescribed

extraction criteria" is equivalent to the preset values of the current invention.).

a unit for extracting the identified special character strings (0037-0040; 0117;

0262; 0352; Maeda discloses an extracting and storing unit for extracting and store any

important items contained in the received structure document.).

an output unit for outputting the extracted character strings (0094; Maeda

discloses a reception device for displaying the portion extracted.).

In regards to dependent claim 2, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for extracting*

information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein said unit for

identifying special character strings determines a certain character string as a special

one on the basis of the typographic information of said formatted document when the

typographic information of said character string is determined to be special typographic

information (0037-0040; 0144-0146; 0153-0155; Maeda discloses a synonym database

of extraction name tags, which is used is used to search for the extracted tag name.).

In regards to independent claim 7, Maeda discloses a *method for extracting*

information from a formatted document comprising:

inputting a formatted document, analyzing the input formatted document and

saving analysis results containing particular typographic information (0037-0039; 0137-

0138; 0344; 0352; 0361; Maeda discloses a document obtaining unit for obtaining a

structured document. Maeda also discloses the important item extraction unit searches

any important item contained in the received structured document and automatically

extracts the important items and store them in the important item storage unit. The

Examiner concludes the "important items" are the tags, which represent the structure of

the document (0039-0040).).

identifying special character strings on the basis of the analysis results via preset

values of the typographic information (0037-0040; 0214; Maeda discloses an extracting

and storing unit for extracting at least one important portion from the structured

document according to prescribed extraction criteria specified in advance. Using the

broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes that "prescribed extraction

criteria" is equivalent to the preset values of the current invention.).

extracting the identified special character strings (0037-0040; 0117; 0262; 0352;

Maeda discloses an extracting and storing unit for extracting and store any important

items contained in the received structure document.).

outputting the extracted character strings (0094; Maeda discloses a reception

device for displaying the portion extracted.).

In regards to dependent claim 8, Maeda discloses *the method according to*

claim 7, wherein in said identifying of special character strings, a certain character string

is determined as a special one on the basis of the typographic information of said

formatted document when the typographic information of said character string is

determined to be special typographic information (0037-0040; 0144-0146; 0153-0155;

Maeda discloses a synonym database of extraction name tags, which is used is used to

search for the extracted tag name.).

In regards to dependent claim 13, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for*

extracting information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein the unit

for identifying special character strings on the basis of the analysis results sends the

typographic information to the unit for extracting the identified special character strings if

the typographic information of said character strings is beyond a range of the preset

values (0037-0040; 0214; 0092; Maeda discloses an extracting and storing unit for

extracting at least one important portion from the structured document according to

prescribed extraction criteria specified in advance. Using the broadest reasonable

interpretation, the Examiner concludes that "prescribed extraction criteria" is equivalent

to the preset values of the current invention. Maeda further discloses determining a

range of the extracted important items. Thus Meada teaches extracting the identified

special character strings if the typographic information of said character strings is

beyond a range of the preset values.).

In regards to dependent claim 14, Terayama discloses *the method according*

to claim 7, wherein said extracting extracts the special character strings if the

typographic information of said character strings is beyond a range of the preset values

(0037-0040; 0214; 0092; Maeda discloses an extracting and storing unit for extracting at

least one important portion from the structured document according to prescribed

extraction criteria specified in advance. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation,

the Examiner concludes that "prescribed extraction criteria" is equivalent to the preset

values of the current invention. Maeda further discloses determining a range of the

extracted important items. Thus Meada teaches extracting the identified special

character strings if the typographic information of said character strings is beyond a

range of the preset values.).

Note

6.   It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 3-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maeda in view of Okamoto in view of (Pub. No.: US

2002/0065814 A1; Effective Filing Date: Jun. 30, 1998) (hereinafter "Okamota").

In regards to dependent claim 3, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for extracting*

information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein:

said formatted document is an HTML document (0082; Maeda discloses the

structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said unit for identifying special character*

strings identifies a certain character string character as a special one on the basis of

the analyzing results with respect to said HTML document when the font size of said

character string is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding character

strings.

However, Okamota teaches *said unit for identifying special character strings*

identifies a certain character string character as a special one on the basis of the

analyzing results with respect to said HTML document when the font size of said

character string is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding character

strings (0037-0040; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search

indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string

(font size) being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been *determined to be*

the biggest one among the surrounding character strings. Thus Okamota teaches

identifying special character strings a certain character string as a special one on the

basis of the analyzing results with respect to said HTML document when the font size

of said character string is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding

character strings).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a

structured document for display with information on the position of the document

meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 4, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for extracting*

information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein

    said formatted document is an HTML document (0082; Maeda discloses the

structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said unit for identifying special character*

strings determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the

analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color and the font of

said character string is determined to be a special one among the surrounding

character strings.

However, Okamota teaches *said unit for identifying special character strings*

determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the analysis

results with respect to said HTML document when the color and the font of said

character string is determined to be a special one among the surrounding character

strings (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search

indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string

(color and the font) being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been

considered *to be a special one among the surrounding character strings.* Thus

Okamota teaches identifying special character strings determines a certain character

string as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML

document when the color and the font of said character string is determined to be a

special one among the surrounding character strings.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a

structured document for display with information on the position of the document

meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 5, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for extracting*

information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein:

said formatted document is an HTML document (0082; Maeda discloses the

structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said unit for identifying special character*

strings determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the

analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the font of said character

string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font

of said character string to be boldface.

However, Okamota teaches *said unit for identifying special character strings*

determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the analysis

results with respect to said HTML document when the font of said character string is

determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said

character string to be boldface (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for

searching the document search indexes stored in the file unit according to the query

input *(character strings)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

that the matching character string *(boldface)* being searched as taught by Okamota,

could have been *determined to be different from the surrounding character strings.*).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a

structured document for display with information on the position of the document

meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 6, Maeda discloses *the apparatus for extracting*

information from a formatted document according to claim 1, wherein:

   said formatted document is an HTML document (0082; Maeda discloses the

structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said unit for identifying special character*

strings determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the

analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color of said character

string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font

of said character string to be boldface.

However, Okamota teaches *said unit for identifying special character strings determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color of said character string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said character string to be boldface* (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string *(boldface)* being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been *determined to be different from the surrounding character strings.*).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a structured document for display with information on the position of the document meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 9, Maeda discloses *the method according to claim 7, wherein said formatted document is an HTML document* (0082; Maeda discloses the structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis*

results with respect to said HTML document when the font size of said character string

is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding character strings.

However, Okamota teaches *said unit for identifying special character strings*

identifies a certain character string character as a special one on the basis of the

analyzing results with respect to said HTML document when the font size of said

character string is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding character

strings (0037-0040; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search

indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string

(font size) being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been *determined to be*

the biggest one among the surrounding character strings. Thus Okamota teaches

identifying special character strings a certain character string as a special one on the

basis of the analyzing results with respect to said HTML document when the font size

of said character string is determined to be the biggest one among the surrounding

character strings).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a

structured document for display with information on the position of the document

meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 10, Maeda discloses *the method according to claim 7, wherein said formatted document is an HTML document* (0082; Maeda discloses the structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *in said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color and the font of said character string is determined to be a special one among the surrounding character strings.*

However, Okamota teaches *the method according to claim 7, wherein said formatted document is an HTML document, and in t said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color and the font of said character string is determined to be a special one among the surrounding character strings* (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string *(color and the font)* being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been considered *to be a special one among the surrounding character strings.* Thus Okamota teaches identifying of special character string determines a certain character string as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML

document when the color and the font of said character string is determined to be a special one among the surrounding character strings.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a structured document for display with information on the position of the document meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 11, Maeda discloses *the method according to claim 7, wherein said formatted document is HTML document* (0082; Maeda discloses the structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *in the said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the font of said character string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said character string is boldface.*

However, Okamota teaches *in the said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the font of said character string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said*

character string is boldface. (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings).* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string *(boldface)* being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been *determined to be different from the surrounding character strings.*).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a structured document for display with information on the position of the document meeting the character string query (0039).

In regards to dependent claim 12, Maeda discloses *the method according to claim 7, wherein said formatted document is an HTML document* (0082; Maeda discloses the structure document can be an HTML document.).

Maeda does not expressly disclose *said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color of said character string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said character string is boldface.*

However, Okamota teaches *said identifying of special character string, a certain character string is determined as a special one on the basis of the analysis results with respect to said HTML document when the color of said character string is determined to be different from the surrounding character strings and the font of said character string is boldface* (0037-0040; 272; Okamota teaches means for searching the document search indexes stored in the file unit according to the query input *(character strings)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the matching character string *(boldface)* being searched as taught by Okamota, could have been determined to be different from the surrounding character strings.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Maeda with Okamota for the benefit of producing a structured document for display with information on the position of the document meeting the character string query (0039).

Note

9.   It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection. A new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Maeda.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-

5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100